H
44

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY

Annual Report for 1911

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Treasurer.

THORNTON O. M. FAY, Care of New England Trust Company, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Center.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1911

BOSTON:
The Fort Hill Press
Samuel Usher
176-184 High Street
1912

Notes.

1. Our Reports for the years 1890, 1892, 1897, and 1901–11 are the only ones that can now be supplied. The Report for 1905 is a "Review of Twenty-Five Years," giving a summary of the movement regarding the family and our work for that period, and will be freely sent to all who ask for it.

2. The paper of the Corresponding Secretary read before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis, on the "Problem of the Family," and a report of twenty pages of a Committee on the Family, with Prof. A. R. Merriam, chairman, made to the National Council of Congregational Churches in October, 1907, has been reprinted from the minutes of the Council and will also be sent to those who desire it. An address by the Secretary on "Some Fundamentals of the Divorce Question" may also be had on application.

3. The Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and some twenty foreign countries, in two volumes, can be had on application to the Director of the Census, Washington, D. C.

4. A summary of this Report, of twenty pages, has been prepared by the League and will be sent to all who may write the Secretary for it, enclosing a postage stamp.

5. The attention of all is invited to the report of the Treasurer and the need it shows of immediate and generous aid for our work.

Every friend of the home is invited to give us a modest place, at least, in his annual charities. The work of all benevolent societies is aided by everything that is done for the home. The League needs an immediate endowment. A form of bequest may be found on the third page of the cover.

6. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are members in full for the time.

7. The Treasurer, Mr. Thornton O. M. Fay, care of the New England Trust Company, Boston, Mass., will gladly acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass., to whom contributions may also be sent. *It will greatly relieve us if contributions can be sent earlier than the autumn months.*

Minutes.

BOSTON, January 30, 1912.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Twentieth Century Club, No. 3 Joy Street, Boston, on Tuesday, January 30, 1912, at 12 M.

The meeting was called to order by Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq. William H. Cobb led in prayer. W. B. Herrick was chosen Recording Secretary *pro tempore.*

The reading of the records of the last annual meeting was omitted by common consent. The Corresponding Secretary, Dr. Samuel W. Dike, read selections from his annual report.

Voted: To accept the report and refer its publication to the Corresponding Secretary.

Because of the death of Mr. Johnson, Treasurer, the Treasurer's report was made by Dr. Dike and referred to the new Treasurer for approval, and shall be approved when audited by W. B. Herrick, who was appointed Auditor at this meeting.

Mr. Thornton O. M. Fay, New England Trust Company, Boston, was elected a member of the League.

Voted: To reëlect the officers of the previous year with the addition of Thornton O. M. Fay as Treasurer.

The annual meeting was then dissolved.

W. B. HERRICK,

Recording Secretary pro tempore.

Report of the Corresponding Secretary.

WHAT seemed for some months to be a most uneventful year in our work has proved in the end to have been one of more than usual interest. The events of the year show that the country is now looking more than formerly beyond the legal aspects of Marriage and Divorce to other and urgent parts of the problem of the Family.

THE FAMILY IN THE WORK OF RELIGION.

Following the example of the American Sociological Society two years ago, the Religious Education Association, at its meeting in Providence last February, devoted the main part of its sessions for three days to the place of the Family and Home in the work of religious education. The papers read at this meeting are appearing in successive numbers of *Religious Education* and will repay careful attention. But much of the thinking of those who write on this subject is still too largely empirical because we have not yet learned to apply to the problems of the Family the more rigid and fruitful methods of scientific study. Desultory reflection too often takes the place of systematic research here as well as in other parts of the social field. Yet we are steadily gaining, both in interest in the Family and in our methods of its treatment. The admirable work in universities and colleges in that narrower part of the field known as Domestic Science is steadily winning its way in thoughtful minds, and its introduction into secondary and other schools is also a help to the popular appreciation of the problem of the Home.

The great interest in what is known in business as "Scientific Management" has given us the opportunity to call attention again to the need of a more scientific attitude towards problems of ecclesiastical organization, especially in churches having the more democratic type of polity, in respect to their organization for efficiency and the place the Home should have in their work. The Massachusetts State Conference of Congregational Churches took up a project that had miscarried the year before and now has a committee of young men familiar with scientific methods of study at work planning an investigation into the organization and work of these churches with a view to their increased efficiency. This study will probably bring out the defective use now made of the Home.

Some interesting action of the churches will be referred to on another page.

THE LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

There has been rather more of this than usual and its trend is in the direction of conservative law. But it has been through independent action of the several states rather than through enactment of the proposed Uniform Divorce Law.

Alabama now makes certain marriages merely voidable instead of being void *ab initio*.

California provides that a cross complainant in a divorce suit need not be a resident of the state or county to entitle such person to a divorce in the action brought, provided the cross complaint is verified personally. An act also provides that the proof of a marriage may be the same as in a civil suit. Both parties can testify.

Connecticut provides for the better care of the records of marriages, validates marriage licenses issued after the expiration of the term of the registrar's service in certain cases, and further regulates alimony in divorce cases.

Delaware has a new marriage law entire. One of its provisions forbids the recognition of marriages within prohibited degrees that have taken place out of the state by those leaving the state for the purpose. The marriage of the insane is now prohibited and a license must take the place of banns and is required in all cases.

Idaho increases the fee for a marriage license to three dollars, — the highest, with possibly one exception, in the entire country.

Massachusetts now requires that all intentions of marriage must be filed five days before the license can be issued. It prohibits all advertising of divorce business. The court must give notice to the district attorney of all cases where divorce is granted for adultery and may at its discretion give such notice in cases of divorce for other crimes. It regulates the naming of the corespondent so that it shall be done only after the filing of the petition for divorce.

Maine provides that women may be appointed to perform the marriage ceremony.

Michigan further amends its act regarding the marriage of women with child.

Missouri defines more fully the persons who may celebrate marriage.

Nebraska makes the marriage of first cousins void.

Nevada authorizes ministers to celebrate marriages only so long as they continue to minister to the society or congregation named in their license for the purpose. But this state has refused to amend its divorce law in the interests of conservatism; for, to make residence easier, a recent act provides that the required residence may not necessarily be continuous. This was intended to circumvent the action of some judges who were insisting on *bona fide* residence before divorce can be granted. This is known locally as a " time lock " divorce act. But public sentiment is said to be growing in favor of the improvement of the law by another legislature. The illegitimate divorce business, as has been usual in other states, is confined to one

county chiefly. That county granted 160 divorces to 250 marriages in 1909, and 357 divorces to 267 marriages in 1910. In 1911 there were 427 divorces in this county. A considerable number of those divorced are said to marry in the county immediately after divorce. These divorced persons, writes my correspondent, are on the whole "a bad lot." The condition of things in Nevada has never been equaled except for two years in the early territorial situation in Utah. Notwithstanding all this in Nevada, the migration from state to state for easy divorce must now be comparatively very small.

New Hampshire further regulates the issue of marriage licenses.

New York places further restrictions on contract marriages and permits certain officials of the societies for ethical culture to celebrate marriages.

North Dakota directs the courts to specify in the decree the time when the divorced persons can marry under the restriction that hitherto was put upon the marriage of the divorced. It gives certain authority to the courts to regulate alimony or make other provision for the support of the divorced wife.

Oregon now makes the state a party in all divorce suits, provides that its attorney shall be notified, and in all uncontested cases make a defense in good faith.

Pennsylvania makes valid certain returns of *non est inventus* in divorce cases and further regulates procedure.

South Carolina for the first time requires a marriage license, with its return and record. It imposes a fine for failure to comply with the law but does not invalidate the marriage. New Jersey is now the only state that does not require a marriage license of its own citizens, though it does when both parties are non-residents. This completes the entire list of states. All now have marriage laws, twelve having come into the system in the last thirty years. Under the new law in South Carolina only ministers of the gospel and Jewish rabbis can celebrate marriages.

Texas amends its law requiring consent of parents or guardians in the case of the marriage of minors and removes certain of the legal disabilities of married women.

Wisconsin makes absolute instead of discretionary the recent law forbidding the marriage of divorced persons for one year after the decree is entered.

A UNIFORM MARRIAGE LAW.

After three years of work, following two or three of tentative study by commissions appointed by the governors of the states, a Uniform Marriage Law has been completed and was given to the public November 1. It is confined to the regulation of Marriage and Marriage Licenses, leaving of necessity some things to the control of the states to suit their separate conditions. This act is avowedly not

so nearly an ideal one as may be found in some European countries, but such an approach to it as seems practicable in the conditions of American life and legislation. It has been most carefully wrought out after the criticisms and suggestions of jurists and others from every part of the country. It is in the direction of the movement of American law on the subject. A brief summary of some of its chief points follows. These can be readily compared with similar points in European law by reference to the summary in our Report for 1909, or more fully by turning to the Report of the Census Office of 1909, Part I.

Insistence on a license as the prerequisite of marriage in all cases is the fundamental provision of the proposed law, but with proper qualifications, as in the case of marriages innocently contracted without license. As noted on an earlier page, the last of the states, with a qualified exception in the case of New Jersey, has within a year adopted a marriage license law. Under the Uniform Act all so-called common-law marriages are made void. The license can issue only in the town or county or other prescribed jurisdiction where one of the parties at least resides, this to be fixed by state law. Except in certain cases of emergency, application for license must be made five days before it can be issued. In Europe a requirement of this kind is universal, but there a longer time must elapse before the marriage can take place. In addition to the present usual requirements, the facts as to nationality, color, and occupation must be given. The certificate of the dissolution, whether by death or divorce, of a former marriage must accompany the application for a license. Among other things this is a valuable safeguard against bigamies. The parties must be properly identified and the law as to marriageable age strictly observed. Notice of the application with names and residences of the parties must be posted in the office that is to issue the license, and provision is made for objections to the marriage. The marriage may be celebrated in any town or city of the state except in case of non-residents, when it shall be solemnized in the town or city where the license is issued. But the issue of the license does not remove the legal disabilities under which the parties may be, and the license shall so state. A certificate of marriage in a prescribed form shall be issued in duplicate and one copy be returned for filing, the license itself being recorded. The Marriage License Docket shall be open for inspection or copying. A duly certified copy of the marriage license or the marriage certificate shall be received in the courts as *prima facie* evidence of the marriage. Provision is made to render legitimate in certain cases illegitimate children.

The adoption of this proposed Uniform Marriage Law may, as has been the case with the Uniform Divorce Act, which has been passed entire in only three states, but which is substantially the law in others, come slowly. But this will depend a good deal on the interest the citizens of the several states take in its adoption. There has been

for many years an unconscious tendency towards a uniform system of marriage law. This and the knowledge we now have of the more careful systems of European law will help the movement.

The British Royal Commission on Divorce has not yet reported on its very difficult problem.

UNIFORM ECCLESIASTICAL ACTION.

A greater degree of uniformity among the churches in dealing with both marriage and divorce is quite as important, to say the least, as uniformity on the part of the civil authorities. Attention has been called to this subject during the past year with peculiar force by an unfortunate marriage in Providence of persons of social prominence who could not be married under the laws of their own state or the rules of their own church, but who, after several refusals, found a minister who would marry them. And this was done though the marriage was shocking to the better moral sense of the country.

Were the provisions of the Uniform Divorce Act relating to comity between the states everywhere in force, this marriage would have been civilly impossible. Had the ministers all acted on the principle of comity that lies at the basis of the proposed provision of the civil law, no clergyman would have celebrated the marriage.

The feature of the Uniform Divorce Law is that which forbids the courts of a state to entertain a suit for divorce for a cause that is not a legal cause in the state where the parties reside. A further protection is in the provision that no state will recognize a divorce obtained by its own citizens in another state on grounds forbidden at home. According to this principle, a minister —whatever his personal views may be as to the justifiableness of divorce for several reasons — would feel compelled in the exercise of Christian comity to refuse to marry persons who could not be married by their own ministers.

ACTION OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES.

On this point the Committee on Family Life of the Federal Council of the Churches of America have sent out the following in their appeal:

"The clergy have widely called for some provisions to meet the evils of discordant legislation, especially as a protection against migratory marriage and divorce. But we especially urge a similar comity between the churches themselves, so that persons who cannot be married by their own ministers will not resort to those of other churches for their object. Do not consistency, the responsibilities for social leadership, and the obligations of Christian fraternity demand this course from all our churches? Shall we not in this way observe that comity between churches that we are demanding of the states?"

The further recommendations of the committee are worth noting here:

"We also urge at this time great care in the marriage of persons unknown to the officiating clergyman, and of those who are morally or physically unfit for married life.

"The terrible evils of sexual vice are in urgent need of attention by the clergy, teachers, and parents, in ways that are wise and efficient. We gratefully recognize the growing interest in this subject and urge the leaders of the church to become intelligent concerning it and to coöperate in all practical ways with the medical profession and with competent associations for dealing with it.

"Our churches should lead their people to see that the family has its true place in the activities of religion, education, industry, and public order. As implied in what we said at the outset, the vigor and safety of all other institutions depend on the extent to which they strengthen the life of the family. Every tendency in any of these that weakens the home should be resisted. Every plan for their own welfare should include a knowledge of its effect on the home. Because of its importance and because of its relative neglect the home should receive more direct and positive attention."

It is hoped that the wide circulation of this appeal to the Protestant and other allied churches of the country and the response that should come of it will be of great practical value. But this will depend on what shall be done about it.

THE ACTUAL PRACTICE OF MINISTERS.

While writing this a curious commentary on the point just treated comes in the Registration Report of the city of Providence for the year 1910. In that year the number of persons divorced who were married in that city was 109, or a little over 5 per cent of the total number married, showing, as other figures have done, that divorce for the object of another marriage is less frequent than is popularly supposed. The report points out that "the proportion of marriages of divorced persons has decreased, not increased, as is generally believed." The report also gives the number of marriages by the clergymen of the different denominations and the number of marriages of the divorced in the same way. Of the 109 marriages of divorced persons in the city, nearly 11 per cent were by the civil authorities; 15.5 per cent of all the marriages which Baptist clergymen celebrated were those of divorced persons. Among Congregationalists, 17.2 per cent were of this class; among the Methodist Episcopal, 11.5 per cent; and among the United Presbyterian, 25 per cent of those they married were divorced persons. Among the Episcopalians, who married the largest number of couples next to the Roman Catholics, in only one instance, or less than one half of one per cent of all their marriages, there was a divorced person.

While of course there may have been a considerable number of excusable cases among these, it is singular that the Episcopal clergy found only one of them while others had so many. The statistics of following years will show how much practical impression the denunciations of the notorious marriage of last summer made on ministers of various denominations.

LEGISLATIVE DIVORCES UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

In August, Gov. Simeon E. Baldwin, of Connecticut, sent to the legislature of that state a veto of a bill of the legislature granting a divorce. The ground on which the veto was based is that the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States makes all such divorces unconstitutional inasmuch as they discriminate between the privileges and rights of those who go to the courts and those who are divorced by a legislative act. Coming from a jurist of the highest standing, this veto has a value only second to that of a direct decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which would in all probability sustain it. Its practical importance is in the probably final blow it gives to this recognized abuse which, according to Howard, was common in Colonial times and has existed here and there down to the present day. Connecticut for several years prior to 1850 granted many legislative divorces. Delaware granted no less than 100 through its legislature in 1897. But in that year an amendment of the State Constitution forbade them. The practice has pretty much disappeared in foreign countries.

COURTS OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS.

These have been recently established in Chicago and New York, where they act as courts of first instance in many cases and result in the settlement by reconciliation in some and in the withdrawal of suits in many others, besides dealing with many domestic troubles that would otherwise issue in divorce suits. It is reported that large numbers of divorce suits have been settled to the satisfaction of the parties involved in them. A movement is on foot to establish a Court of Domestic Relations in Massachusetts to have control of all divorce cases in the first instance, and of those only. Those interested, lawyers of much experience in this class of cases, believe such a court, coming into close and often confidential relations with disaffected couples, can get at more fully than the ordinary courts do the real conditions of domestic trouble that lie beneath the reasons technically given, and so do much good. As our Report for 1909 showed, no less then fourteen European countries make statutory provision for efforts at reconciliation. Efforts of this kind do good in two directions: They effect a happy settlement in a considerable number of cases that come into court, and the simple knowledge that such efforts

will be made by the court leads an unknown but probably very considerable number of married people to settle their troubles themselves without going at all to the courts with them. It is to be hoped that some settled policy along this line may be worked out. Meanwhile it is good to know that conscientious lawyers often settle privately quite as many incipient divorce cases as they take into court.

The Secretary of the League has been asked to read a paper on Marriage and Divorce Statistics, at the Fifteenth International Congress on Hygiene and Demography, which on invitation of a joint resolution of our National Congress is to meet in Washington in September. Probably this paper will point to the need of using the courts of reconciliation in this and other countries to get at data throwing light on the real causes of divorce that lie back of those given in open court. Our former Reports have mentioned our desire for this and the obstacles in the way of its achievement. Perhaps the way may soon be opened to some success in this direction.

SEX EDUCATION AND HYGIENE.

This subject, to which our Reports have referred in the past, has come to the front to an unusual degree the past year. The Report of the Chicago Vice Commission, by far the most thorough and comprehensive ever made on the subject, at least in the United States, and a document of great self-restraint and cautious statement, shows the enormous proportions to which the evils of the vices of sex have grown. Their money cost, their effects on crime and poverty, their awful ruin of character, and their hereditary results are appalling. And it is claimed that Chicago is by no means an exceptional city in this respect. One of the results of the increasing knowledge there is of the extent and results of this evil is that young women of the better class and their parents are taking alarm and the former are refusing marriage for fear of its contagion.

Fortunately the year past has been marked by an unusually wide increase of interest in the prevention of this evil, especially through sound education. Dr. Prince A. Morrow wrote in June that eighteen societies had then been organized in different parts of the country and that these had been federated. The Federation is under the name of the American Federation for Sex Education and Hygiene. Ex-President Eliot of Harvard is the Honorary President, Dr. Morrow is President, Henry L. Higginson Treasurer, and Charles W. Birtwell General Secretary, with the Boston office at 6 Hancock Avenue. Dr. Henry P. Wolcott is Chairman of the Massachusetts Committee and Mr. Birtwell its Secretary. Other men of equally high standing in the community are among the leaders. Already generous sums have been placed at its disposal for the work. Under this able and eminently sane leadership much good may be done. Another society with similar objects — the American Purity Federa-

tion, before which your Secretary read a paper at its Congress in Columbus, Ohio, in October — is at work, chiefly in the Middle West. It is hoped that this body will soon come into the Federation and thus make one strong society commanding the respect and support of the entire country. Probably no other social evil demands more attention and skillful treatment than this.

The Report, already noted, on the Social Evil in Chicago, by the Vice Commission, a body appointed by the Mayor and City Council, in a volume of 400 pages presents the results of a thorough investigation of the subject in all its bearings. The statements that millions of dollars are spent annually on this form of vice, and concerning its evil influence through its alliance with gambling, intemperance, and political corruption, and, above all, its destructive effects on human life and character would seem incredible were it not that they are supported by the most carefully collected and classified data, with deductions conservatively made. And yet Chicago is believed to be no worse in this respect than other large cities.

The American Federation for Sex Education and Hygiene has come none too soon.

CERTAIN DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR MARRIAGE.

In the year there has been unusual interest in the need of greater care in respect to physical and mental disqualifications for marriage, especially those due to sexual disease. The recent increase of knowledge concerning the subtle and prolonged effects of the milder of the venereal diseases is, as already intimated, creating serious and just alarm over the risks of marriage, and parents and others are anxiously looking for greater safeguards. Naturally, public opinion is turning in some quarters to greater legal protection. We, therefore, have compiled from the United States Report of 1909 on Marriage and Divorce the following summary of the data relating to disqualifications for marriage other than those concerning age, the consent of parents, sexual competency, and matters connected with those points. Similar data for foreign countries were given in our Report for 1910.

No Regulation by Statute.

Thirteen states and territories make no regulation by statute. These are Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indian Territory, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas. But some of these states secure the aims of these restrictive measures through provisions in their divorce laws.

Disqualifications in the Other States.

Arkansas declares void all marriages when at the time either party is incapable of consenting to the marriage from want of understanding.

California provides for their annulment when either party is of unsound mind.

Connecticut makes criminal marriages of the epileptic, imbecile, or feeble-minded.

Delaware makes marriage with a person insane at the time void.

The *District of Columbia* makes voidable the marriage of an idiot or person judged insane.

Georgia declares the marriage of an insane person void.

Idaho provides for the annulment of a marriage when either party is of an unsound mind.

Illinois makes void the marriage of an insane person or idiot.

Indiana provides that no license to marry shall be issued where either party is an imbecile, epileptic, of unsound mind, nor to any person who is or has been within five years an inmate of any county asylum or home for indigent persons, unless it satisfactorily appears that the cause of such condition has been removed and that such male applicant is able to support a family and likely to so continue; nor shall any license issue when either of the contracting parties is affected with a transmissible disease, or at the time of making application is under the influence of an intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug. (Act of April 15, 1905.)

Iowa makes the marriage of the insane or idiotic subject to annulment.

Kansas prohibits the marriage of an epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, or insane person except the woman be over forty-five years of age.

Kentucky prohibits the marriage of an idiot or lunatic.

Maine declares void the marriage of an insane or idiotic person.

Massachusetts prohibits the marriage of insane persons or idiots.

Michigan prohibits the marriage of insane persons and idiots. It also provides that no person who has been confined in any public institution or asylum as an epileptic, feeble-minded, imbecile, or insane patient shall be capable of contracting marriage unless before the issuance by the county clerk of the license to marry there be filed in the office of said county clerk a verified certificate from two regular physicians of the state that such person has been completely cured of such insanity, epilepsy, imbecility, or feeble-mindedness and there is no probability that such person will transmit any of such defect or disability to the issue of such marriage. By an act of 1899 persons afflicted with certain venereal diseases and not cured are forbidden to marry.

Minnesota prohibits the marriage of a woman under the age of forty-five or a man of any age (except he marry a woman over forty-five) if either party is an epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, or afflicted with insanity.

Montana provides for the annulment of marriages of persons of unsound mind.

Nebraska makes void marriages of those insane or idiotic at the time of marriage.

Nevada makes voidable marriages where either party is incapable for want of understanding of assenting to the marriage unless there is voluntary cohabitation after such incapacity is removed.

New Jersey prohibits any person who has been confined in any public asylum or institution as an epileptic, insane, or feeble-minded patient from intermarrying within the state without a certificate from two regular physicians.

New York makes voidable marriages to which either party is incapable of consenting from want of understanding.

North Carolina makes all marriages voidable where either party is incapable of contracting for want of will or understanding.

North Dakota provides that marriages may be annulled when either party is of unsound mind, unless such party freely cohabits with the other party as husband or wife.

Ohio provides that no marriage license shall be granted where either of the parties, applicants therefor, is an habitual drunkard, epileptic, imbecile, or insane, or who at the time of making application for said license is under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or drug.

Oklahoma declares void the marriage of an insane person or idiot.

Oregon makes voidable marriages where either party is incapable of contracting or consenting for want of sufficient understanding.

Rhode Island declares marriages void when either party is an idiot or lunatic.

South Carolina prohibits the marriage of idiots and lunatics.

Utah prohibits the marriage of the insane and lunatic and those persons who have syphilis or gonorrhea and are uncured, and those having chronic epileptic fits.

Vermont makes voidable marriages when either party is an idiot or lunatic, unless after the restoration of such persons to reason the parties voluntarily cohabited.

Virginia makes voidable the marriage of the insane.

Washington, by act of 1909, prohibits the marriage of a common drunkard, an habitual criminal, the epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, an idiot or insane person, or one afflicted with pulmonary tuberculosis in its advanced stages, or any contagious venereal disease.

West Virginia makes marriages of the insane voidable.

Wisconsin both prohibits and makes void the marriage of the insane and idiotic and also makes them criminal.

Wyoming prohibits the marriage of the insane and idiotic.

Summary by Causes.

Insanity, Lunacy, and Want of Understanding or Will to Consent. — Thirty-four states or jurisdictions make restrictions under some one of these terms; Arkansas, New York, North Carolina, and Oregon,

— Oregon using the last of the three terms given above. The other states are: California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The Imbecile and Feeble-Minded.— Eight states specify the imbecile or feeble-minded as follows: Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, and Washington.

Idiotic. — Fifteen states and the District of Columbia specify the idiotic as follows: District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi (providing divorce in such cases), Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Incapable of Consent. — Four states put a restriction in this form: Arkansas, New York, North Carolina, and Oregon.

Epilepsy. — Nine states specify epilepsy. They are Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Utah, and Washington.

Drunkenness is named in the statutes of only two states as a bar to marriage. Ohio specifies habitual drunkenness and Washington the common drunkard.

Venereal and other contagious diseases are a bar to marriage in four states. Indiana names only a transmissible disease and Michigan, by an act of 1899, and Utah and Washington, by acts of 1909, specify venereal diseases as a bar to marriage.

The Indigent. — One state, Indiana, regulates with considerable care the marriage of the indigent.

As the suggestion is frequently made that the marriage of those afflicted with venereal disease should be legally regulated, inquiry has been made into the working of the law on the subject in Michigan,— the only state that has had the law long enough to fairly test it. The testimony of leading men interested in checking these diseases is that the law has no practical value. It is easy to see why such a law must be to a great extent a failure and that our hope must rest on the influence of education, in various ways, and on the direct action of the parties to be married, their parents, pastors, and physicians. The evils are of a grave character, both on account of their wide prevalence and their most serious effects on the parties immediately concerned and their descendants. But their legal prevention is difficult.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Some extended statement was made a year ago on this subject. That year the Corresponding Secretary intimated that he could not allow another debt to accumulate. As no other person could readily

be found to take up the work, as much would come to him any way, and the League by special vote requested his continued service, he decided to do what he could and accept as his salary such money as might be left after meeting the general expenses of the year. He has acted on this plan, makes no account of the deficit for 1910, a small one of $114.65, and accepts the $1,512.16 that is left, after meeting the other expenses of the past year, for his salary. He will continue, if desired, on the same basis for another year.

DEATH OF OUR TREASURER.

The League, as well as other philanthropic organizations and many public interests, has met a great loss in the sudden death, January 14, 1912, of Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, who for nearly eight years was our Treasurer. His faithful discharge of the duties of the office, his unfailing courtesy, his personal interest in the work, together with the aid he gave us with his own contributions and those he directly or indirectly secured from others, greatly endeared him to us.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

Receipts		$1,710.09
Expenses:		
Telephone and express	$5.65	
Postage	35.50	
Printing	77.75	
Stationery	10.43	
Traveling	68.60	
Total general expense	$197.93	
Paid to Rev. S. W. Dike on account of salary	1,512.16	
		$1,710.09

January 31, 1912.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer, for the year ending December 31, 1911, with vouchers for the same, and find them correct.

W. B. Herrick, *Auditor*.

RECEIPTS.

Jan.	4.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	$50 00	
	9.	Pres. Wm. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center, Mass.,	5 00	
	14.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	23.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.	5 00	
	23.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	26.	Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
		Total received in January		$120 00
Feb.	2.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge, Mass	$2 00	
	3.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
	7.	Mrs. Frederick Billings, New York, N. Y.	110 00	
	10.	Rev. Claudius B. Spencer, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.	5 00	
	23.	Prof. F. G. Peabody, D.D., LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.,	10 00	
	27.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston, Mass.	5 00	
	28.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston, Mass.	5 00	
	28.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	28.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford, Mass.	2 00	
		Total received in February		$159 00
March	1.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester, Mass.	$5 00	
	1.	Prcs. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	2.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester, Mass.	10 00	
	2.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., LL.D., Trenton, N. J.,	10 00	
	2.	Messrs. Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass.	10 00	
	3.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
	3.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	3.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	4.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	4.	Mrs. George Ripley, Andover, Mass	10 00	
	4.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	4.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	

March 6.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale, Mass.	$10 00	
7.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
7.	Prof. A. B. Bassett, Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
9.	Hon. Walter George Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.	5 00	
9.	James C. Braman, Bangor, Me.	10 00	
11.	Mrs. John S. Kennedy, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
11.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, N. Y.	50 00	
11.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston, Mass.	5 00	
15.	Rev. William H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center, Mass.	5 00	
15.	Old South Church, Boston, Mass.	25 00	
15.	St. Paul's Church, Boston, Mass.	25 00	
21.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover, Mass.	10 00	
22.	Prof. Walter F. Wilcox, LL.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
28.	Arba N. Lincoln, Fall River, Mass.	5 00	
31.	Rev. George L. Paine, Dorchester, Mass.	5 00	
	Total received in March		$303 00
April 1.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.	$5 00	
5.	Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge, Mass.	5 00	
14.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
17.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale, Mass.	5 00	
18.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston, Mass.,	25 00	
27.	"A Friend," Boston, Mass.	50 00	
	Total received in April		$93 00
May 4.	St. Paul's Church, Concord, N. H.	$5 00	
23.	Prof. Samuel Hart, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
23.	C. E. Clift, Arlington, Mass.	5 00	
	Total received in May		$15 00
June 3.	Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge, Mass.	$5 00	
3.	Edward Bok, Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
10.	George B. Knapp, Auburndale, Mass.	10 00	
20.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, D.D., New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	Total received in June		$65 00
July 8.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.	$15 00	
11.	Samuel V. Hoffman, Morristown, N. J.	25 00	
17.	Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
19.	Rev. Eliot White, New York, N. Y.	2 00	
	Total received in July		$52 00
Aug. 10.	R. S. Norris, Honolulu, Hawaii		$5 00
Sept. 23.	F. B. Marsh, New York, N. Y.	$10 00	
25.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
	Total received in September		$35 00
	Total received in the quarter	$92 00	
Oct. 9.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown, Mass.	$10 00	
12.	St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn.	12 09	
16.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	2 00	
16.	"A Friend," Connecticut	5 00	
20.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia,	25 00	
20.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
21.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston, Mass.	5 00	
21.	Herbert A. Wilder, Newton, Mass.	10 00	
	Total received in October		$94 09

Nov.	5.	Rev. William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	$10 00
	7.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York, N. Y.	10 00
	11.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00
	11.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester, Mass.	10 00
	15.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale, Mass.	25 00
	18.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	30 00
	18.	Miss Grace Dodge, New York, N. Y.	100 00
	18.	E. P. Dutton, New York, N. Y.	10 00
	20.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	5 00
	20.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00
	20.	Trinity Church, Boston, Mass.	25 00
	21.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00
	22.	Prof. William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00
	22.	Prof. Leverett W. Spring, D.D., Boston, Mass.	5 00
	27.	Robert C. Ogden, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	25 00
	27.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester, Mass.	3 00
	30.	W. W. Lockwood, Riverside, Cal.	5 00
		Total received in November	$298 00
Dec.	5.	Hon. Robert H. Gardiner, Boston, Mass.	$10 00
	6.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00
	7.	Rev. William C. Gordon, Ph.D., Auburndale, Mass.	5 00
	7.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00
	7.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston, Mass.	25 00
	7.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston, Mass.	25 00
	11.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York, N. Y.	25 00
	12.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	14.	Church of the Ascension, New York, N. Y.	25 00
	14.	Mrs. Alexander Mackay-Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.	10 00
	14.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston, Mass.	5 00
	14.	Prof. Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	14.	Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.	5 00
	15.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00
	15.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00
	20.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield, Mass.	10 00
	20.	First Baptist Church, Newton Center, Mass.	25 00
	20.	Rev. Herbert Lathe, Prescott, Ariz.	5 00
	20.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale, Mass.	2 00
	21.	Prof. Charles R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00
	21.	William H. Swift, Pittsfield, Mass.	25 00
	21.	Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio	10 00
	25.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston, Mass.	5 00
	25.	"A Friend," Thompson, Conn.	5 00
	25.	Hon. Arthur Wellman, Malden, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Hon. Elbridge Torrey, Boston, Mass.	10 00
	30.	Church of the Advent, Boston, Mass.	10 00
	30.	Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., New York, N. Y.	10 00
	30.	Guy M. Winslow, Ph.D., Auburndale, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston, Mass.	10 00
	30.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	30.	Arthur C. Farley, Wellesley Hills, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Pres. George E. Horr, D.D., Newton Center, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Miss Maria R. Hicks, Fall River, Mass.	2 00
	30.	Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Prof. Theodore S. Woolsey, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	15 00
	30.	Rev. Cornelius F. Patton, D.D., Newton, Mass.	5 00
	30.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
	30.	"A Friend," Chestnut Hill, Mass.	25 00
		Total received in December	$471.00

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. THORNTON O. M. FAY, care of The New England Trust Company, Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.